UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA CHARLOTTE DIVISION 3:22-cv-00627-FDW-DCK

JARVIS BERNARD BITTLE,)	
Plaintiff,)	
vs.)	ORDER
)	ORDER
SIGIS EL OWL,)	
Defendant.)	

THIS MATTER is before the Court on Plaintiff's failure to respond to the Court's November 29, 2022 Order [Doc. 3].

During a recent two-month period, the *pro se* Plaintiff filed seven civil actions in this Court without paying the filing fee and seeking to proceed *in forma pauperis* in each.¹ On November 29, 2022, the Court denied the Plaintiff's Application to proceed *in forma pauperis* in the instant case due to his pattern of abusive, frivolous, malicious, and harassing litigation, and ordered him to pay the full filing fee within 14 days. [Doc. 3]. Plaintiff was cautioned that the failure to timely comply with the Order would result in this case's dismissal without further notice. [Id. at 5-6]. The Order was mailed to the Plaintiff at his address of record the same day it was entered. [See 11/29/2022 Docket Entry]. Plaintiff has not paid the filing fee and the time to do so has expired. Therefore, this action will be dismissed without prejudice. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) ("If the plaintiff fails to prosecute or to comply with these rules or a court order, a defendant may move to dismiss the action or any claim against it."); Link v. Wabash R.R. Co., 370 U.S. 626, 630-33 (1962)

1

¹ The Plaintiff recently filed Case Nos. 3:22-cv-499-FDW-DCK, 3:22-cv-500-FDW-DSC, 3:22-cv-514-MOC-DSC, 3:22-cv-521-FDW-DCK, 3:22-cv-626-RJC-DSC, 3:22-cv-627-FDW-DCK, 3:22-cv-628-RJC-DSC. Additional cases may be filed before this Order is entered.

(although Rule 41(b) does not expressly provide for *sua sponte* dismissal, Rule 41(b) does not imply any such restriction and a court has the inherent power to dismiss a case for lack of prosecution or violation of a court order).

The Court also ordered that the Plaintiff show cause, within 14 days, why a pre-filing review system should not be imposed on him. [Doc. 3 at 5-6]. The Court ordered that the Plaintiff "shall file a single document, not to exceed more than three (3) pages, succinctly explaining why he believes the Court should not impose the above-described pre-filing review system." [Id.]. It expressly warned Plaintiff that "his failure to fully comply with this directive will result in the Court's imposition of the subject pre-filing review system." [Id. at 6].

Plaintiff has failed to respond to the Court's show cause Order. Accordingly, for the reasons set forth in the Court's prior Order [Doc. 3], the Court will direct that all documents submitted by the Plaintiff in the future will be pre-screened by the Court for content. Any proposed filings that are not made in good faith or which lack substance or merit will be returned to the Plaintiff without further explanation. Such a review system "will allow the Plaintiff to have access to the Courts for his legitimate concerns but will prevent him from usurping the Court's resources with his baseless submissions." Vandyke v. Francis, No. 1:12-cv-128-RJC, 2012 WL 257747, at *3 (W.D.N.C. July 3, 2012); Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(b)-(c).

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that this action is **DISMISSED** without prejudice for the Plaintiff's failure to comply with the Court's November 29, 2022 Order.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a pre-filing review system is hereby **IMPOSED**, and all documents submitted by the Plaintiff in the future, whether in this case or in any other action filed in this District, will be pre-screened by the Court for content. Any proposed filings that are

not made in good faith or which lack substance or merit will be returned to the Plaintiff without further explanation.

The Clerk is instructed to mail a copy of this Order to the Plaintiff at his address of record as well as to 4303 Houldsworth Drive, Charlotte, NC 28213,² to add this case to the Plaintiff's Filer Status Report in CM-ECF, and to close this case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed: December 21, 2022

Frank D. Whitney United States District Judge

² Plaintiff notified the Court of a new address in Case No. 3:22-cv-00628-RJC-DSC, Doc. 4. Plaintiff has not similarly so notified the Court in the instant case.